

**Re: New figure**

**Bob Benson** to: Hilbert, Timothy (hilbertj)

01/19/2011 10:31 AM

From: Bob Benson/R8/USEPA/US

To: "Hilbert, Timothy (hilbertj)" <HILBERTJ@UCMAIL.UC.EDU>

---

This is exactly what I was looking for. I think it makes good sense to using the 1973 mean value.

"Hilbert, Timothy (hilbertj)" ---01/19/2011 10:15:53 AM---Bob, The attached figure contains a curve which has not been doubled from 1972 back until 1967. Ins

From: "Hilbert, Timothy (hilbertj)" <HILBERTJ@UCMAIL.UC.EDU>  
To: Bob Benson/R8/USEPA/US@EPA  
Cc: "Lockey, James (lockeyje)" <lockeyje@UCMAIL.UC.EDU>  
Date: 01/19/2011 10:15 AM  
Subject: New figure

---

Bob,

The attached figure contains a curve which has not been doubled from 1972 back until 1967. Instead we took the 1973 mean value (chosen because it has many data points, while 1972 only has 4) and assumed that value back historically.

Can you please confirm this is what you were looking for? If this is right, we'll go ahead and create new tables for you.

Thanks

Tim[attachment "matrix data 01182011-1.pdf" deleted by Bob Benson/R8/USEPA/US]